




THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 15, 2012

TO: Honorable Councilmember Todd Gloria, Budget Review Committee Chair and
Budget Review Committee Members

FROM: Mark Leonard, Financial Management Director 

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Review Committee Referral Response

This memorandum is in response to questions asked at the Review Committee Meeting held on May 3, 2012. The responses are listed by department in the order that they were reviewed by the Committee.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

COUNCIL DISTRICT 8

QUESTION:

Why isn't the General Plan Update fee fully cost recoverable?

RESPONSE:

The fully cost recoverable amount of General Plan Maintenance Fee was calculated based on a single year of costs. However, due to the large number of variables annually in maintaining the City's General Plan, the amount of the proposed General Plan Maintenance Fee for Fiscal Year 2013 was developed using a three year average of expenditures related to General Plan. This three year average resulted in a proposed General Plan Maintenance Fee of \$275 which is less than if the fee was calculated based on a single year of expenditures.

Furthermore, the General Plan Maintenance Fee was not developed with the intention of fully recovering the cost of maintaining the City's General Plan at this time, but rather with the intention of sharing the burden between the building industry and the General Fund. Actual cost recovery percentages will be monitored against the three year average of expenditures, and subsequent fee adjustments will be presented as necessary in future user fee analyses.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 6

QUESTION:

How many field staff has Neighborhood Code Compliance (NCC) lost since five years ago?

RESPONSE:

From Fiscal Year 2008 to Fiscal Year 2012, NCC has reduced field staff by 13.00 FTE.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 5

QUESTION:

What is the total amount budgeted for all community plan updates?

RESPONSE:

In Fiscal Year 2012, there is \$2.23 million budgeted for the community plan updates currently in process, of which \$1.38 million comes from the General Fund. Other funding sources for the community plan updates include grants and redevelopment funds.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 7

QUESTION:

How many people are needed and how much money is needed to kick up the graffiti program?

RESPONSE:

The Fiscal Year 2013 Proposed Budget includes the elimination of 4.00 FTE positions and expenditures totaling \$297,582; the restoration of these positions and expenditures will be considered for the May Revision. In addition to the restoration, the following five additional positions would be needed in order to restore the graffiti program to pre-Fiscal Year 2011 levels when the last significant changes were implemented:

- 1.00 Utility Supervisor, \$113,000 in expenses
- 2.00 Utility Worker IIs, \$178,000 in expenses
- 2.00 Utility Worker Is, \$170,000 in expenses

QUESTION:

How well has the partnership with ARJIS and SANDAG on Graffiti Tracker worked?

RESPONSE:

SANDAG was responsible for collecting statistics to write the one-year account of the City of San Diego's use of the Graffiti Tracker Program. They collected the numbers based on the statistics created from the City's Street Gang Unit. SANDAG was not responsible for completing any other activities.

ARJIS did not factor into the San Diego Police Department's use of the Graffiti Tracker. To the knowledge of the Police Department, ARJIS has not done anything related to the City's Graffiti Tracker Program. The resources the Police Department has used during the past year extends to other law enforcement agencies including the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (Trolley).

QUESTION:

How much funding has been collected from the graffiti tracker program, including recovery of damages?

RESPONSE:

There is not a current tool used to collect restitution information for the City or District Attorney's Office related to Graffiti Tracker. The San Diego County Court Collections would need to provide the numbers. Without the case numbers from the City Attorney and District Attorney, the restitution cannot be determined since they are the ones who handle prosecution.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 1

QUESTION:

How many Community Plans have been updated more than 20 years ago? 25 years? 30 years?

RESPONSE:

Attachment 1 provides the comprehensive breakdown of when community plans were last updated. Approximately 67% of all plans are 20 years old. The Development Services Department's (DSD) performance measure on community plan updates will be amended to reflect this information.

QUESTION:

Is there a plan for how DSD expects to complete community plan updates for each community area?

RESPONSE:

At this time, no comprehensive timeline has been developed for the scheduling of future community plan updates. City Planning staff in DSD is currently at update capacity with ten community plan updates and one major community plan amendment in process. As the initial three community plan updates begin the hearing process in Fiscal Year 2013, additional community plan updates may be added.

QUESTION:

How often should updates happen for Facilities Financing Plans? What is an appropriate metric?

RESPONSE:

For Facility Benefit Assessments (FBA), Council Policy 600-36 (March 1995) requires that the City Manager prepare an Annual Review Report for each FBA. Based on the Annual Review

Report, or at other times as the City deems proper, the City shall modify the FBA. Development Services Department staff would recommend that the Council Policy be revised to remove the Annual Review Report requirement, as the Report is not an update, and it takes City resources away from updates in order to prepare the Reports. As the FBA is a cash flow-based methodology that uses a development forecast and is based on market conditions, we would recommend frequent updates to FBAs. Considering the number of FBAs, the staff time involved to update the plan, the high level of community involvement, the number of public hearings, and the required public noticing because it is an impact fee, updating FBAs every two years would be a reasonably optimistic schedule.

There is no established schedule to update Development Impact Fee (DIF)-based Public Facilities Financing Plans (PFFP). Considering the large number of DIF communities in San Diego and current City staffing levels, that the DIF-based communities are typically in urbanized communities that are at or near build-out, that the DIF fee methodology does not rely on a cash flow, and that the San Diego Municipal Code allows for an annual construction cost escalator, staff would suggest an update schedule of five years for DIF's. This timing would allow staff to revisit the plans on a regular basis to update costs, and to reflect any changed circumstances in the community that may affect the prioritization of the construction of the public facilities.

Please note that in addition to the above suggested schedules, PFFPs will be updated concurrently with community plan updates and may also be updated concurrently with community plan amendments, depending on the nature of the community plan amendment.

QUESTION:

What is the plan for updating La Jolla's plan district ordinances (PDO)?

RESPONSE:

The current plan for switching PDOs over to citywide zoning is to do so in conjunction with their associated community plan updates. The La Jolla Community Plan was updated in calendar year 2003 but there was little support to switch the PDO over to citywide zoning and no changes were brought forward.

At this point in time, there is no funding available to do this work. DSD would commit staff to the La Jolla PDOs if, 1) there is demonstrated support for the changes in the community; and 2) funding is identified to pay for the effort.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 3

QUESTION:

What is the status of the Mid-City Financing Plan update?

RESPONSE:

This plan is not currently one of the 20 Financing Plans in DSD's work program.

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

COUNCIL DISTRICT 7

QUESTION:

How much revenue does the City receive as a result of the power purchase agreement?

RESPONSE:

The Environmental Services Department (ESD) receives royalties of 8% on the energy sold from the North City Cogeneration, which is approximately \$110,000 per year. With the expansion and sale of energy to the Marines, royalties will go up another \$220,000 for a total of \$330,000 per year, shared equally between the Public Utility Department's and ESD's Refuse Disposal Enterprise fund.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 8

QUESTION:

ESD has added FTE and associated expenditures in an effort to increase curbside recycling. What is the anticipated savings for the lifespan of the Miramar Landfill as a result of this effort?

RESPONSE:

ESD expects that two to four weeks of landfill space will be saved over the remaining life as a result of these increased recycling efforts. In addition to extending the life of the landfill, curbside recycling repurposes over 60,000 tons per year of valuable resources (fiber, glass, plastic and metals) back into commerce and provides the City with approximately \$80 per ton in revenues, expected to total over \$5.0 million in Fiscal Year 2012.

TRANSPORTATION AND STORM WATER

COUNCIL DISTRICT 4

QUESTION:

Could policies be changed so that graffiti in channels are cleaned up within seven months rather than a year?

RESPONSE:

Graffiti in channels is currently addressed on a regular basis when reports of graffiti are received and proactively once per year when regular channel maintenance occurs. To proactively visit all channels every seven months would not correspond with regular channel maintenance and would require additional capacity in Urban Corps and Alpha Project contracts.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 8

QUESTION:

What was the breakdown of road overlay miles in Fiscal Year 2012 by funding source?

RESPONSE:

The Fiscal Year 2012 Adopted Budget provided \$13.4 million in TransNet funding and \$11.8 million in Gas Tax to fund approximately 26 and 23 miles, respectively. Additional bond funding of \$30.6 million is anticipated to be reviewed by Council in spring and will provide for an additional 62 miles.

QUESTION:

What would an additional position or an additional \$1.0 million do to increase the capacity of TSW to maintain the roads?

RESPONSE:

An additional \$1 million would provide for approximately 10 miles of slurry seal or 2 miles of overlay. An additional Assistant Engineer position would assist in the street selection and prioritization processes, conduct field surveys, determine the type of repair and maintenance needed, estimate contract quantities, and manage resurfacing projects.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 3

QUESTION:

Please provide the vacancy factor by department.

RESPONSE:

Attachment 2 provides the vacancy factor by department.

Mark Leonard/mc

Attachments (2):

1. City of San Diego Community Plan Update Status
2. Fiscal Year 2013 Proposed Vacancy Savings

cc: Honorable Mayor Jerry Sanders
Honorable Council Members
Jan I. Goldsmith, City Attorney
Eduardo Luna, City Auditor
Jay M. Goldstone, Chief Operating Officer
Wally Hill, Assistant Chief Operating Officer
Julie Dubick, Chief of Staff

Page 7

Honorable Councilmember Todd Gloria, Budget Review Committee Chair and
Budget Review Committee Members

May 15, 2012

Almis Udrys, Deputy Director of IRD & Fiscal Policy
Andrea Tevlin, Independent Budget Analyst
Amy Gowan, Director of Council Affairs
Scott Chadwick, Labor Relations Director
Kelly Broughton, Director of Development Services Department
Chief William Lansdowne, Chief of Police
Chris Gonaver, Director of Environmental Services Department
Kip Sturdevan, Director of Transportation and Storm Water Department
Financial Management Staff

City of San Diego Community Plan Update Status

Attachment 1

Community Plans	Year Last Updated	Anticipated CPU Completion Date	Update Cost Estimate	Timeline	10+ years since Update	15+ years since Update	20+ years since Update	25+ years since Update	30+ years since Update
Barrio Logan ¹	1978	FY13	\$2.7 million	In Update	X	X	X	X	X
Black Mountain Ranch	1998		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X				
Carmel Mountain Ranch	1984		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	
Carmel Valley	1975		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	X
Centre City	2006		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months					
Clairemont Mesa	1989		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X		
College Area	1989		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X		
Del Mar Mesa	2000		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X				
East Elliott	1971		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	X
Fairbanks Ranch Country Club	1982		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	X
Greater Golden Hill ¹	1988	FY14	\$3.6 million ²	In Update	X	X	X		
Kearny Mesa	1992		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X		
La Jolla	2003		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months					
Linda Vista	1998		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X				
Mid-City Communities (Eastern, City Heights, Normal Heights, Kensington-Talmadge)	1998		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X				
Midway Pacific Hwy Corridor ¹	1991	FY14	\$2.4 million ³	In Update	X	X	X		
Mira Mesa	1992		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X		
Miramar Ranch North	1980		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	X
Mission Beach	1974		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	X
Mission Valley	1985		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	
Navajo ¹	1982	FY14 ⁴	\$2.0 million	In Update	X	X	X	X	X
North Park ¹	1986	FY14	\$3.6 million ²	In Update	X	X	X	X	
Ocean Beach ¹	1975	FY13	\$0.8 million ⁵	In Update	X	X	X	X	X
Old Town San Diego ¹	1987	FY14	\$2.4 million ³	In Update	X	X	X	X	
Otay Mesa ¹	1981	FY13	\$1.8 million ⁶	In Update	X	X	X	X	X
Otay Mesa-Nestor	1997		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X			
Pacific Beach	1995		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X			
Pacific Highlands Ranch	1999		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X				
Peninsula	1987		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	
Rancho Bernardo	1978		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	X
Rancho Encantada	2001		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X				
Rancho Peñasquitos	1993		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X			
Sabre Springs	1982		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	X
San Pasqual Valley	1995		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X			
San Ysidro ¹	1990	FY14	\$3.0 million	In Update	X	X	X		
Scripps Miramar Ranch	1978		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	X
Serra Mesa	1977		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	X
Skyline Paradise Hills	1987		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	
Southeastern San Diego/Encanto ¹	1987	FY15	\$2.7 million	In Update	X	X	X	X	
Subarea II NCFUA	1992		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X		
Tierrasanta	1982		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	X
Tijuana River Valley	1976		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	X
Torrey Highlands	1996		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X			
Torrey Hills	1997		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X			
Torrey Pines	1995		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X			
University	1987		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	
Uptown ¹	1988	FY14	\$3.6 million ²	In Update	X	X	X		
Via de la Valle	1984		\$2 - \$3 million	36 months	X	X	X	X	
Total	48				46	40	33	24	15

Footnotes

- 1: Highlighted rows represent a CPU update in process.
- 2: Estimate includes the total cost of updating Greater Golden Hill, North Park, and Uptown as a cluster.
- 3: Estimate includes the total cost of updating Midway Pacific Hwy Corridor and Old Town San Diego as a cluster.
- 4: Major Community Plan Ammendment
- 5: Estimate does not include pre-FY 2010 costs.
- 6: Estimate does not include pre-FY 2009 costs.

Attachment 2: Fiscal Year 2013 Proposed Vacancy Savings

General Fund		Vacancy Savings
Administration	\$	(59,363)
City Attorney	\$	(965,386)
City Clerk	\$	(54,059)
City Comptroller	\$	(162,177)
City Treasurer	\$	(172,412)
Council District 5	\$	(60,736)
Debt Management	\$	(54,059)
Development Services	\$	(187,481)
Economic Development	\$	(66,768)
Environmental Services	\$	(221,162)
Financial Management	\$	(65,291)
Fire-Rescue	\$	(5,127,420)
Library	\$	(645,753)
Office of Homeland Security	\$	(66,768)
Office of the Mayor	\$	(58,157)
Park & Recreation	\$	(931,673)
Personnel	\$	(59,114)
Police	\$	(8,810,215)
Public Works - Engineering & Capital Projects	\$	(1,065,503)
Public Works - General Services	\$	(514,800)
Purchasing & Contracting	\$	(49,109)
Real Estate Assets	\$	(54,059)
Transportation & Storm Water	\$	(815,820)
General Fund Total	\$	(20,267,285)
Agency Funds		
City Employee's Retirement System Fund	\$	(343,897)
Agency Funds Total	\$	(343,897)
Enterprise Funds		
Airports Fund	\$	(59,363)
Development Services Fund	\$	(7,546,230)
Golf Course Fund	\$	(123,843)
Metropolitan Sewer Utility Fund	\$	(1,070,474)
Municipal Sewer Revenue Fund	\$	(952,249)
Recycling Fund	\$	(157,874)
Refuse Disposal Fund	\$	(294,666)
Water Utility Operating Fund	\$	(1,665,969)
Enterprise Funds Total	\$	(11,870,667)
Internal Service Funds		
Central Stores Fund	\$	(116,688)
Energy Conservation Program Fund	\$	(59,363)
Fleet Services Operating Fund	\$	(44,366)
Risk Management Administration Fund	\$	(126,714)
Internal Service Funds Total	\$	(347,131)
Special Revenue Funds		
Facilities Financing Fund	\$	(42,578)
Information Technology Fund	\$	(109,855)
Local Enforcement Agency Fund	\$	(60,674)
Maintenance Assessment District (MAD) Management Fund	\$	(42,578)
OneSD Support Fund	\$	(65,416)
QUALCOMM Stadium Operations Fund	\$	(62,005)
Wireless Communications Technology Fund	\$	(66,685)
Special Revenue Funds Total	\$	(449,791)
Non-General Fund Total	\$	(13,011,486)
Citywide Total	\$	(33,278,771)